



WAR #

TRANSMITTAL FORM (to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)	Application No.	10/074,958	
	Filing Date	February 11, 2002	
	First Named Inventor	McGregory Belniak	
	Art Unit	2129	
	Examiner Name	Joseph P. Hirl	
Total Number of Pages in This Submission		Attorney Docket Number	5378P001

ENCLOSURES (check all that apply)		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fee Transmittal Form <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fee Attached <input type="checkbox"/> Amendment / Reply <input type="checkbox"/> After Final <input type="checkbox"/> Affidavits/declaration(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Extension of Time Request <input type="checkbox"/> Express Abandonment Request <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement <input type="checkbox"/> PTO/SB/08 <input type="checkbox"/> Certified Copy of Priority Document(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Response to Missing Parts/Incomplete Application <input type="checkbox"/> Basic Filing Fee <input type="checkbox"/> Declaration/POA <input type="checkbox"/> Response to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53	<input type="checkbox"/> Drawing(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Licensing-related Papers <input type="checkbox"/> Petition <input type="checkbox"/> Petition to Convert a Provisional Application <input type="checkbox"/> Power of Attorney, Revocation Change of Correspondence Address <input type="checkbox"/> Terminal Disclaimer <input type="checkbox"/> Request for Refund <input type="checkbox"/> CD, Number of CD(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Landscape Table on CD	<input type="checkbox"/> After Allowance Communication to TC <input type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to TC (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief) <input type="checkbox"/> Proprietary Information <input type="checkbox"/> Status Letter <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Enclosure(s) (please identify below): <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; margin-top: 10px;">-Check for \$250.00 -Return postcard</div>
Remarks		

SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT	
Firm or Individual name	Paul A. Mendonsa, Reg. No. 42,879 BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP
Signature	
Date	March 5, 2007

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING/TRANSMISSION			
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service on the date shown below with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Appeal Brief-Patents, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.			
Typed or printed name	Katherine Jennings		
Signature		Date	March 5, 2007



FEE TRANSMITTAL for FY 2006

Patent fees are subject to annual revision.

Complete if Known

☒ Applicant claims small entity status. See 37 CFR 1.27.

TOTAL AMOUNT OF PAYMENT

(\$)

250.00

Application Number

10/074,958

Filing Date

February 11, 2002

First Named Inventor

McGregory Belniak

Examiner Name

Joseph P. Hirl

Art Unit

2129

Attorney Docket No.

5378P001

METHOD OF PAYMENT (check all that apply)

☒ Check ☐ Credit card ☐ Money Order ☐ None ☐ Other (please identify): _____

☒ Deposit Account Deposit Account Number: 02-2666 Deposit Account Name: Blakely, Sokoloff, Taylor & Zafman LLP

For the above-identified deposit account, the Director is hereby authorized to: (check all that apply)

☐ Charge fee(s) indicated below

☐ Charge fee(s) indicated below, except for the filing fee

☒ Charge any additional fee(s) or underpayment of fee(s)
under 37 CFR §§ 1.16, 1.17, 1.18 and 1.20.

☒ Credit any overpayments

FEE CALCULATION

Large Entity

Small Entity

Fee Code Fee (\$)

Fee Code Fee (\$)

Fee Description

Fee Paid

1051 130

2051

65

Surcharge - late filing fee or oath

1052 50

2052

25

Surcharge - late provisional filing fee or cover sheet.

2053 130

2053

130

Non-English specification

1251 120

2251

60

Extension for reply within first month

1252 450

2252

225

Extension for reply within second month

1253 1,020

2253

510

Extension for reply within third month

1254 1,590

2254

795

Extension for reply within fourth month

1255 2,160

2255

1,080

Extension for reply within fifth month

1401 500

2401

250

Notice of Appeal

1402 500

2402

250

Filing a brief in support of an appeal

250.00

1403 1,000

2403

500

Request for oral hearing

1451 1,510

2451

1,510

Petition to institute a public use proceeding

1460 130

2460

130

Petitions to the Commissioner

1807 50

1807

50

Processing fee under 37 CFR 1.17(q)

1806 180

1806

180

Submission of Information Disclosure Stmt

1809 790

1809

395

Filing a submission after final rejection (37 CFR § 1.129(a))

1810 790

2810

395

For each additional invention to be examined (37 CFR § 1.129(b))

Other fee (specify) _____

SUBTOTAL (2)

(\$)

250.00

SUBMITTED BY

Complete (if applicable)

Name (Print/Type)

Paul A. Mendonsa

Registration No.
(Attorney/Agent)

42,879

Telephone

(503) 439-8778

Signature

Date

03/05/07

Based on PTO/SB/17 (12-04) as modified by Blakely, Sokoloff, Taylor & Zafman (wtr) 12/15/2004.
SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

03/06/2687 CNECA1 00000014 022666 10074958
Sale Ref: 00000014 00000014 022666 10074958
01-FC:2492 250.00 DA



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of:) Examiner: **Hirl, Joseph P**
MacGregor BELNIAK and) Art Group: **2129**
Jorge MORALED A)
Application No. 10/074,958)
Filed: February 11, 2002)
For: **DATA MANIPULATION AND**)
DECISION PROCESSING)

Board of Patent Appeals and Interference
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

APPEAL BRIEF

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 41.37, Appellants submit the following Appeal Brief for consideration by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences ("Board"). Appellants also submit herewith a check in the amount of \$250.00 to cover the cost of filing this opening brief, as set forth in 37 C.F.R. § 41.20(b)(2). Please charge any additional amounts due or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

~~03/08/2007 CNEGA1 00000010 022666 10074958~~
~~01 FC:2402 250.00 DA~~

03/08/2007 CNEGA1 00000019 10074958
01 FC:2402 250.00 OP

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Real Party in Interest	1
II.	Related Appeals and Interferences	1
III.	Status of Claims	1
IV.	Status of Amendments	1
V.	Summary of Claimed Subject Matter	2
VI.	Grounds of Rejection To Be Reviewed On Appeal	3
VII.	Argument	3
A.	<i>A Tutorial on Learning with Bayesian Networks</i> by Heckerman	4
B.	Rejection of Claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)	4
C.	Rejection of Claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)	6
D.	Rejection of Claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)	6
E.	Rejection of Claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)	7
F.	Rejection of Claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)	7
G.	Rejection of Claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)	8
H.	Rejection of Claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)	8
I.	Rejection of Claim 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)	9
VIII.	Claims Appendix	11
IX.	Evidence Appendix	13
X.	Related Proceedings Appendix	14

I. REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

MacGregor Belniak and Jorge Moraleda, the parties named in the caption, transferred their rights in that which is disclosed in the subject application to Data Digest Corporation through an assignment recorded on 17 May, 2002 (see reel/frame no. 012903/0853). Data Digest Corporation subsequently assigned these rights to Remington Partners, a California corporation, through an assignment recorded on 29 May 2002 (see reel/frame no. 012932/0911). Remington Partners further assigned the rights in the material disclosed to Decision Q on 2 August 2002. A *nunc pro tunc* assignment memorializing this transfer was recorded on 31 July 2006 at reel/frame no. 018035/0597.

Decision Q is the owner at the time this brief is filed, and therefore is the real party in interest.

II. RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

Appellants are unaware of any related appeals or interferences that will directly affect, be directly affected by, or have a bearing on the Board's decision in this appeal.

III. STATUS OF CLAIMS

Claims 11-23 are pending in this application. All claims stand rejected. Claims 11-23 are presented for appeal based on arguments in support of independent claims 11 and dependent claims 12, 14, 15, 18-20 and 23.

IV. STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

All amendments have been entered.

V. SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER

The invention concerns methods for analyzing data in a database ([0028]), automatically finding models that correspond to the data ([0030], [0031]), and then using the models to make decisions for new test cases ([0033]). Experts can monitor and guide the modeling process ([0032]).

Independent claim 11 recites a method comprising: dynamically processing a database to eliminate missing values in records, each record to contain a plurality of values ([0048]), preparing a statistical summary of processed data in the database ([0035]), searching through possible relationship models to find a high-scoring network ([0031], [0060], [0061]), and using the high-scoring network to compute a decision for a new case ([0033]). *See also*, Figure 3.

Claim 12 refines the method of claim 11, requiring the additional operation of discretizing continuous variables in the database before preparing the plurality of statistical summaries ([0049]).

Claim 13 refines the method of claim 11, requiring the additional operation of modifying a relationship of the high-scoring network ([0062], [0067]).

Claim 14 refines the method of claim 11, limiting it to the situation where the new case consists of values of a subset of fields of a record ([0033]).

Claim 15 refines the method of claim 11, limiting it to the situation where records in the database represent bank customer transaction records, and the decision is to identify an at-risk customer of the bank ([0034]).

Claim 16 refines the method of claim 11, limiting it to the situation where the statistical summary is a Bayesian model of correlations between data in records ([0040]).

Claim 17 refines the method of claim 11, limiting it to the situation where the decision is one of a detection of an illegal financial transaction, a network

fault diagnosis, or a prediction of a result of a pharmaceutical compound in an organism ([0029], [0043]).

Claim 18 refines the method of claim 11, requiring the additional operations of aggregating similar database records together and computing a frequency of occurrence ([0046]).

Claim 19 refines the method of claim 18, limiting it to the situation where aggregating comprises preparing a plurality of hashes to cluster the database records ([0046]).

Claim 20 refines the method of claim 11, limiting it to the situation where the database structure is an alternating decision tree (“ADTree”) ([0051], [0057]).

Claim 21 refines the method of claim 11, limiting it to the situation where the database structure comprises correlation statistics between nodes ([0040]).

Claim 22 refines the method of claim 11, requiring the additional operation of inferring a value of a non-observed variable based on a previous observation and the high-scoring network ([0070], [0071]).

Claim 23 refines the method of claim 11, requiring the additional operation of storing the high-scoring network in an eXtensible Markup Language (“XML”) format ([0079]).

VI. GROUND OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL

Claims 11-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by A *Tutorial on Learning With Bayesian Networks* by Heckerman (“*Heckerman*”). Applicants present separate arguments in support of independent claim 11 and dependent claims 12, 14, 15, 18-20 and 23.

VII. ARGUMENT

Applicants will present a brief overview of the reference of record and explain generally why the reference fails to support the rejections of the pending claims. Detailed analyses of the rejections follow.

A. A Tutorial on Learning with Bayesian Networks by Heckerman

The Examiner rejects all claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by a technical report authored by David Heckerman and published in 1995 (revised in 1996) by Microsoft Research ("*Heckerman*").

Heckerman, true to its title, is a tutorial-style introduction to Bayesian Networks and their use in machine learning. It begins with an overview of the mathematical bases underlying Bayesian analysis, considered in the context of a simple example with only a limited number of observations and possible outcomes. Subsequently, the concepts are extended to problems with larger numbers of variables.

Heckerman may be likened to a collection of user's manuals describing various tools in a toolbox. There is a great deal of information that is useful to those of skill in the relevant arts, but the manuals do not instruct the reader to build any particular thing.

Heckerman, inasmuch as it is a tutorial, *does* discuss certain specific applications in its examples. However, as Applicants will explain below, the examples are different from the claimed material, so the reference fails to teach or suggest the claimed elements, arranged as recited in the claims. Consequently, the rejected claims are allowable over this reference.

B. Rejection of Claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Independent claim 11 recites a method comprising several operations, including dynamically processing a database to eliminate missing values in records, each record to contain a plurality of values; preparing a statistical summary of processed data in the database; constructing a database structure to hold the statistical summary; searching through possible relationship models to find a high-scoring network; and using the high-scoring network to compute a decision for a new case. These operations define a "soup to nuts" process by

which an embodiment of the invention can produce a decision based on information in a database.

The Examiner rejects most elements of this claim as anticipated by two sections of *Heckerman*: Section 6, which discusses “Methods for Incomplete Data,” and Section 12, “A Simple Example.” The “Methods for Incomplete Data” section does describe several techniques for addressing missing values, but (as mentioned earlier) it is in the nature of an instruction manual for dealing with a particular situation. That situation does not exist in the “Simple Example” of Section 12. There, the imagined database is fully populated, so missing value handling is not implicated.

Furthermore, although claim 11 requires searching through possible relationship models to find a high-scoring network, the example considered in *Heckerman*’s Section 12 does not perform such searching. Instead, *Heckerman* selects two similar network structures and asserts that they are the only two that have appreciable probability (*see* p. 36:1-4). Another example discussed later in Section 12 also uses a hand-constructed Bayesian network (*see* p. 36:16-18), not a high-scoring network found during a search through possible relationship models.

Finally, the Examiner asserts that the claimed operation of preparing a statistical summary of the processed data in the database is anticipated by *Heckerman*’s Abstract, if one assumes that the claimed “statistical summary” is synonymous with the Abstract’s “probabilistic semantics.” Applicants believe that there are very few passages in which the words “statistical summary” could be replaced by “probabilistic semantics,” and *Heckerman*’s Abstract is certainly not one of them. *Heckerman* is describing characteristics of graphical models that are Bayesian networks, and asserting that they have the useful property of being able to answer causal questions like “why did this happen?” as well as probabilistic questions like “what are the chances that this will happen again?” These properties may be present in Bayesian networks, and they may be useful,

but it is not clear that they have anything to do with the claimed operation of preparing a statistical summary of processed data in the database.

Applicants have no quarrel with *Heckerman*'s descriptions of Bayesian networks, their strengths and weaknesses, or the accuracy of the mathematical derivations presented. However, most of *Heckerman* merely presents a menu of options and possibilities, leaving the selection and combination thereof to the implementer. In *Heckerman*'s examples that do outline a relatively complete set of choices, the choices are different from Applicants' claimed method. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that *Heckerman* does not disclose each element of the rejected claim, arranged as stated in the claim. The Board should overturn the rejection of claim 11.

C. Rejection of Claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claim 12 refines the method of claim 11, requiring that continuous variables in the database be discretized before preparing the statistical summaries. This is said to be anticipated by *Heckerman* at p. 9:11. However, that portion of the reference (generally) is presenting the background mathematics upon which Bayesian networks are founded, and the cited portion specifically notes that "the observed variable *X* is discrete, having *r* possible states..." (see *Heckerman*, p. 9, l. 11). In addition to being disconnected from any specific sequence of operations, the reference *already has* discrete data, so there is no need to discretize a continuous variable, as claim 12 recites. The Board should overturn the rejection of claim 12.

D. Rejection of Claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claim 14 refines the method of claim 11, limiting it to circumstances where the new case for which a decision is to be computed consist of values of a subset of fields of a record. Although *Heckerman* does discuss missing values, unobserved values, and related subjects, the portion relied upon by the Examiner (p. 12, ll. 16-23) discusses challenges that may be encountered in building a

Bayesian network and not producing a decision based for a new case with missing values. Applicants' review of other sections that concern missing values does not disclose a connection to any of *Heckerman*'s proposed sequences for computing a decision, so it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claim 14 is inadequately supported. The Board should overturn the rejection of this claim.

E. Rejection of Claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claim 15 recites a specific application of the method of claim 11, wherein the database records represent bank customer transaction records, and the decision is to identify an at-risk customer of the bank. The Examiner rejects this in view of a passage in *Heckerman* that discusses identifying fraudulent credit card transactions. Thus, although bank customer transaction records are arguably involved, the decision in each case is different. *Heckerman* purports to identify (possibly) fraudulent transactions, while the method of claim 15 identifies at-risk customers. A customer is different from a transaction, so the reference fails to teach or suggest every element of the claim. The Board should overturn the rejection of claim 15.

F. Rejection of Claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claim 18 recites a refinement of the method of claim 11, comprising aggregating similar database records and computing a frequency of occurrence. This is rejected in view of a portion of *Heckerman* that contrasts the Bayesian approach with classical probabilistic analysis of a simple system: throwing a thumbtack up and determining the probability that it will land on its point or on its head. It is the classical probabilistic analysis in which the results of several throws are combined to produce an estimate of the probability for a subsequent throw. Thus, the "aggregating" arguably disclosed in this portion of the reference is irrelevant to the Bayesian network approach discussed in the example relied upon to reject the base claim of claim 18. In addition to the deficiencies in the rejection of base claim 11, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of

claim 18 rests on material that cannot be incorporated. The Board should overturn the rejection of claim 18.

G. Rejection of Claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claim 19 refines the method of claim 18, requiring the use of hashes to cluster the database records. This claim is rejected in view of a brief discussion of variables whose values correspond to the possible true values of the physical probability. Hashes, on the other hand, are pseudo-random numbers that represent a sort of condensation or compression of data. Hashes are often irreversible, but are useful to compare two (possibly large) data objects: if the data objects have the same hash value, then they are (very likely to be) identical.

This property is useful in grouping (or clustering) database records, as recited in the claim, but it is not clear what *Heckerman's* variables, discussed at p. 5:33 through p6:1, have in common with such hashes. Applicants respectfully request that the Board overturn the rejection of claim 19.

H. Rejection of Claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claim 20 refines the method of claim 11, requiring that the database structure be an alternating decision tree (“ADTree”). The Examiner asserts that an ADTree is a binary tree, and that *Heckerman's* binary variables achieve the same result. An ADTree may, indeed, be a binary tree, but the converse is not true: not all binary trees are ADTrees. Furthermore, the portion of *Heckerman* relied upon by the Examiner does not appear to address binary trees. For example, the Bayesian network depicted in *Heckerman's* Figure 4 is not a binary tree (note that “Sample 1,” “Y” has three parent nodes). It is also unclear that the cited text has much to do with either binary trees or binary variables, though perhaps there is a deeper connection that seems implicit to the Examiner but is lost on Applicants. Applicants respectfully request that the Board carefully review the rejection of claim 20.

I. Rejection of Claim 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)


Claim 23 extends the method of claim 11, requiring the high-scoring network to be stored in an eXtensible Markup Language (“XML”). This claim is rejected in view of *Heckerman*’s mention of a system called BUGS that was developed by Thomas, Spiegelhalter, and Gilks. The Examiner asserts that “BUGS is available in hypertext markup language which for the purpose intended is not functionally distinct from extensible markup language.” However, no support for this assertion is offered, and even assuming (arguendo) that the first part is true, it does not follow that HTML is not functionally distinct from XML. XML has many differences from HTML, as those of skill in the relevant arts will be aware, and may be thought of as a superset of HTML. It is significant that the claim recites XML: HTML would not offer adequate functionality for the purposes of an embodiment of the invention. The Board should overturn the rejection of this claim.

Conclusion

Based on the foregoing, Applicants request that the Board overturn the rejection of all pending claims and hold that all of the claims currently under review are allowable.

Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN, LLP

Dated: March 5, 2007


Paul A. Mendonsa, Reg. No.: 42,879


12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025

(503) 439-8778

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that the correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage for first class mail, in an envelope addressed to:

Assistant Commissioner for Patents
Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450


Katherine Jennings

March 5, 2007
Date

VIII. CLAIMS APPENDIX

The claims involved in this appeal are presented below.

1.–10. (Canceled)

11. (Previously Presented) A method comprising:
dynamically processing a database to eliminate missing values in records,
each record to contain a plurality of values;
preparing a statistical summary of processed data in the database;
constructing a database structure to hold the statistical summary;
searching through possible relationship models to find a high-scoring
network; and
using the high-scoring network to compute a decision for a new case.
12. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 11, further comprising:
discretizing continuous variables in the database before preparing the
plurality of statistical summaries.
13. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 11, further comprising:
modifying a relationship of the high-scoring network.
14. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 11 wherein the new case
consists of values of a subset of fields of a record.
15. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 11 wherein records in the
database represent bank customer transaction records, and the decision is to
identify an at-risk customer of the bank.
16. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 11 wherein the statistical
summary is a Bayesian model of correlations between data in records.

17. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 11 wherein the decision is one of a detection of an illegal financial transaction, a network fault diagnosis, or a prediction of a result of a pharmaceutical compound in an organism.
18. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 11, further comprising:
aggregating similar database records together; and
computing a frequency of occurrence.
19. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 18 wherein aggregating comprises:
preparing a plurality of hashes to cluster the database records.
20. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 11 wherein the database structure is an alternating decision tree (“ADTree”).
21. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 11 wherein the database structure comprises correlation statistics between nodes.
22. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 11, further comprising:
inferring a value of a non-observed variable based on a previous observation and the high-scoring network.
23. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 11, further comprising:
storing the high-scoring network in an eXtensible Markup Language (“XML”) format.

IX. EVIDENCE APPENDIX

No other evidence is submitted in connection with this appeal.

X. RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX

No related proceedings exist.